DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 413 119 RC 021 143

AUTHOR Belcher, Rebecca Newcom; Cole, Jack T.; D'Alonzo, Bruno J.
TITLE Opinions of Inclusive Education: A Survey of Rural Teachers and Administrators.
PUB DATE 1996-00-00
NOTE 28p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Educational Attitudes; Educational Needs; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inclusive Schools; Instructional Effectiveness; Mainstreaming; *Regular and Special Education Relationship; Rural Education; School Responsibility; *Special Education; *Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Attitudes toward Disabled; New Mexico

ABSTRACT

A survey of 39 special and general education teachers and administrators from 7 New Mexico towns assessed their knowledge and acceptance level of fully inclusive education within the rural, culturally and linguistically diverse state. The results were analyzed by two subpopulations, general and special education teachers, and the total population of educators, administrators and related service personnel. Results indicate that while most professionals were generally supportive of inclusive education, a small percentage (7-15 percent) was consistently unsupportive on all items. Rural areas face special problems in implementing the New Mexico State Department of Education's Policy on Full Inclusion and providing a full spectrum of special education services. The survey results give credence to the view that professionals located in rural New Mexico have several areas of confusion concerning inclusive education. In general, the educators were supportive of the inclusion philosophy but unsupportive of specific actions or practices (such as therapists in the general classroom) that would occur during implementation of inclusion. The survey questionnaire and response rates are included. (Author/TSP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 413 119

Opinions of Inclusive Education:

A Survey of Rural Teachers and Administrators

Rebecca Newcom Belcher

Gadsden Independent School District, Anthony, New Mexico

Jack T. Cole

Bruno J. D'Alonzo

New Mexico State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. N. Belcher
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

RC021143

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The present study was an effort to assess the knowledge and acceptance level of fully inclusive education of teachers of special and general education, and administrators within the rural, culturally and linguistically diverse state of New Mexico. Sixty professionals in attendance at a recent New Mexico Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) State Conference were surveyed on Inclusive Education. The results were analyzed by two subpopulations, educators teaching in general and special education, and the total population of educators in general and special education programs, administrators, and related service personnel. The results of the study indicate that while the majority of professionals in attendance at the presentation were generally supportive of inclusive education, a small percentage (7-15%), were consistently unsupportive on all items with considerable disagreement among all parties on nine items. The educators were supportive of the inclusion philosophy, but unsupportive of specific inclusionary actions or practices that would occur in their general education classrooms during the implementation of inclusion.

Opinions of Inclusive Education:

A Survey of Rural Teachers and Administrators

Recently, a great deal of discussion and controversy has been generated regarding fully inclusive education of students with disabilities. Proponents of inclusive education question the effectiveness of pull-out programs and a dual system of education. In general, proponents of inclusive education cite the unnecessary segregation and labeling of children combined with the ineffective practice of mainstreaming, which splinters a student's academic and social life, as justification for removing the current dual system (National Association of State Boards of Education, 1992).

During research for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Congress stated that there were over 8 million children with disabilities in the United States and that more than one half of them did not receive appropriate educational services. In addition, state and local educational agencies' financial resources were inadequate to meet the special education needs of children with disabilities. The purpose of IDEA was to ensure that all children with disabilities had access to a free appropriate public education (FAPE) which included special education and related services as needed by the child [20 USC § 1400(b)(1-8)(c)].

Rural Education

The Census Bureau defines rural areas as communities with fewer than 2,500 inhabitants or fewer than 1,000 inhabitants per square mile where as an urban population comprises all persons living in: (a) places of 2,500 or more inhabitants incorporated as cities, villages, boroughs, and towns but excluding those persons living in the rural portions of extended cities; (b) census designated places of 2,500 or more inhabitants; and (c) other territory, incorporated or unincorporated included in urbanized areas (U. S. Department of Commerce, 1994). Rural schools are being challenged to an unprecedented extent. Social issues previously identified

with non-rural areas (e.g. drug and alcohol abuse, HIV incidence, crime, juvenile delinquency, and suicide) actually have been found to be proportionally more prevalent in rural areas (Helge, 1992). Helge (1981) identified and elaborated upon major rural special education implementation factors which included cultural factors (e.g., language barriers, differences in educational values, resistance to change, and economic class differences), geographic and climatic inhibiting factors (e.g., poor roads, mountainous road hazards, prohibitive distances between schools and services), and socioeconomic factors (e.g., low tax base, suspicion of external interferences, migrantcy, and difficulty in recruitment and retention of qualified staff). Rural school systems face problems similar to those of large, urban schools (e.g., diverse caseloads and personnel shortages). In addition to the obvious barrier to service delivery of small populations over vast land areas, rural systems must also overcome other barriers, including limited access to services, limited public awareness of speech, language, and hearing disorders, and a limited number of professionals who provide such services (Chezik, Pratt, Stewart, & Deal, 1989).

Research conduced by Bowe (1985) reveals that a substantial number of minority children and adults with disabilities reside in rural areas. For example, at least 50% of all African Americans live in the South, 40% of Hispanics reside in the West and Southwestern regions of the United States; whereas, approximately 46% of the American Indian population live on reservations (O'Connell, 1987). Minority and bilingual/bicultural families represent a wide array of customs, cultures, ethnic and language groups. Therefore, approaches to the provision of services must take into consideration geographic, climatic, socioeconomic, and cultural implementation factors.

The leaders of rural schools have been issued a major challenge (Brown & McIntire, 1995). They are responsible for the provision of services designed to keep all students in school, to maximize their potential and aspirations, and to make

reports as to the success they have achieved to local, state, and federal constituencies. The values, beliefs, and assumptions that drive these new schools will be different from those of traditional schools. They will have to make a commitment to make a difference in learning for all students and for all members of the school community. They are being challenged to provide programs and services for all students; to establish student learning outcomes for all students; and to create better and more accountable schools for all students to prepare for the 21st century.

Inclusion

A reform movement (York, Vandercook, MacDonald, Heise- Neff, & Caughey, 1992), whose roots were within special education, designed to provide a free, appropriate public education for all children was the Regular Education Initiative (REI). REI's goal was to merge special and general education into one system by dramatically increasing the number of students with disabilities in mainstream classrooms using full-time mainstreaming across the continuum to strengthen the academic achievement of students with mild and moderate disabilities (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994). An outgrowth of the REI was the Full Inclusion movement. Inclusion, inclusive schooling, inclusive education were all terms of the movement to educate all children in general education (York, et al., 1992). Increasingly, special education reform was symbolized by the term inclusive schools. It meant (a) decentralization of power and the concurrent empowerment of teachers and building-level administrators, (b) reorganization of the teaching and learning process through innovations like cooperative learning and thematic teaching, and (c) redefinition of professional relationships within buildings (D'Alonzo & Boggs, 1990; Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994).

Based on the extensive research and the experiences of Pearpoint, Forest, & Snow (1992), inclusive education was defined as children being educated in a heterogeneous, age-appropriate classroom, school or community environment which

maximized the social development of everyone. The vision of full inclusion was based on the belief that all individuals had the right and the dignity to achieve their potential within society. A fully inclusive school valued friendships and diversity as significant outcomes of schooling. Skills and values essential to successful participation in a diverse, integrated society were acquired during an individual's time in school. A full inclusive school community fostered interdependence, respected and valued diversity, and taught the skills necessary to bring out the best in everyone. Full inclusion, through circles of support, maps, and friendships, nourished success through interdependence and collaboration (Pearpoint et al.).

The growing impetus for inclusive education was found in the following statistics which described students enrolled in special education programs, who were generally classified as mildly or moderately disabled and generally mainstreamed into the general education classroom for part or all of the school day. Only 57% of students in special education graduate with either a diploma or a certificate of graduation. In comparing students in general and special education the following data was identified: 12% of youth with disabilities have been arrested at some time in their lives, as compared with 8% in the general population; only 13.4% of all youth with disabilities, aged 15 to 20, are living independently up to two years after leaving secondary school as compared to 33.2% of the general post-secondary school population; and only 49% of out-of-school youth with disabilities aged 15-20 are employed between 1 and 2 years after high school (National Association of State Boards of Education, 1992).

Many proponents of inclusion were in favor of abolishing special education and the continuum of services (Pearpoint et al., 1992). Proponents of eliminating the continuum, were quick to point out that while they wish to see an end to pull out services for students enrolled in special education, they were not advocating dumping or moving children with disabilities into general education classrooms

without appropriate support. Specialists of all types would follow the children into the mainstream, where services would be available to all students. In contrast to inclusion's focus on socialization skills, attitude change, and positive peer relations, REI advocates' primary concern was to strengthen the academic performance of students with disabilities and those at risk for school failure (D'Alonzo & Boggs, 1990; Fuchs & Fuchs, 1994).

New Mexico

In 1994 New Mexico had the third-highest poverty rate in America, the fifth lowest median income, and the second highest number of people without health care. While nation wide the percentage of Americans in poverty dropped under 15% in 1994 to 38.1 million, the percentage increased in New Mexico to 21.1%, up from 17.4% in 1993. Median income declined for New Mexicans from $27,443 in 1993 to $26,905 in 1994. At 23.1%, New Mexico had the second-highest percentage of people not covered in health care programs. According to U. W. Census figures, New Mexico is the most bilingual state in the country, with 36% of the people speaking languages other than English at home. New Mexico also ranks first in the nation for minorities, 38% of the population is Hispanic and 9% is Native American (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1994). New Mexico is a rural, poor, and culturally and linguistically diverse state.

The New Mexico State Department of Education passed Standards for Excellence which allowed schools to develop essential outcomes for all students and it provided a framework for each school to achieve individual state accreditation (New Mexico State Department of Education, 1991). The State Department of Education's Administrative Policy on Full Inclusion adopted in 1991 follows:

> The New Mexico State Department of Education believes that all students must be educated in school environments which fully include rather than exclude them. School environments include all curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular programs and activities. Full inclusion means that all children must be educated

> in supported, heterogeneous, age-appropriate, natural, child-focused classrooms, school and community environments for the purpose of preparing them for full participation in our diverse and integrated society. The New Mexico State Department of Education supports, encourages and will facilitate emerging local practices and creative utilization of resources which address the full inclusion of all children in the local school and community. (p. 2)

Because the New Mexico State Department of Education supported inclusion, each school in New Mexico was challenged to adopt and implement practices which promote inclusion. The New Mexico State Department of Education recognized that the values and beliefs associated with inclusive education cannot be mandated. Consequently, it was the administrative policy of the New Mexico State Department of Education to support, influence, encourage, suggest and guide the local efforts of schools to evaluate and assess its values and beliefs about learning, children, and education.

The present study was an attempt to assess the knowledge and acceptance level of fully inclusive education by teachers of special and general education, and administrators within the rural, poor, and culturally and linguistically diverse state of New Mexico. While this philosophy is gaining widespread support nationally, relatively little focus on research has been given for its implementation within a rural, poor, diverse state. Implementation of inclusive education within such a state will, of necessity, begin with the leaders in education and administration, therefore their knowledge and acceptance level of this philosophy is of prime concern.

Method

Subjects

Sixty professionals in attendance at the New Mexico's Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) State Conference in Albuquerque, New Mexico were surveyed. Of these 60 teachers, 66% or 39 teachers completed the inclusion survey. The demographic

information included questions regarding number of years of teaching experience, number of years of administrative experience, current position, and grade level taught.

INSERT TABLE 1

Of the individuals who responded 39% or 15 of the teachers had taught from 1 to 5 years, 21% or 9 had taught from 6 to 10 years, 25% or 10 had taught from 11 to 15 years and 15% or 5 had taught from 16 to 20 years with a mean number of years of experience of 8.28 years. Of the 39 professionals, 8% (3) were currently teaching in pre-school, 54% (21) were teaching in special education, 31% (12) were teaching in general education, and 8% (3) were involved in providing related services. The professionals were serving in public schools from pre-school to high school. At the pre-school level there were 8% (3), 36% (14) served at the elementary level, 26% (10) at the middle school level, while 23% (9) were at the secondary level.

The subjects resided in seven different cities in New Mexico as identified in Table 2. Albuquerque is one of two large cities located in New Mexico. The rest of New Mexico is sparsely populated with numerous small towns. Although the small cities identified in Table 2 have more than 2,500 inhabitants per community each has fewer than 1,000 inhabitants per square mile, therefore, the communities are identified as rural according to the U. S. Census Bureau 1994 definition.

INSERT TABLE 2

Instrument

A survey questionnaire, based on the research of Kennedy (1990) of Regular Education Initiative (REI), was modified for inclusive education specifically for this study. The professionals in attendance responded to each item on a 5-point Likert scale, from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The instrument contained 22 items designed to measure the attitudes of the professionals toward certain underlying assumptions or views of inclusive education proponents. A sample item of the former

was "Students in special education can be educated in a general classroom with assistance from the special education department". A sample of the latter type of item was "The skills needed to teach mildly disabled and nondisabled students are essentially the same".

Procedure

Each professional was handed a survey instrument upon entering the workshop session on Inclusive Education. Subjects were asked to return the survey by the end of the session or by mail within 4 weeks. After approximately 4 weeks from the return date, each subject who had not responded was contacted again and asked to complete and return the survey. Sixty-six percent, or 39, of the 60 professional in attendance completed the survey.

Results

Summary statistics of the responses of the personnel involved in special education is presented in Table 3. Summary statistics of the responses for the general education personnel is presented in Table 4. Summary statistics for the total population is presented in Table 5. The percentile of responses for each item are ranked from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

INSERT TABLE 3 HERE

INSERT TABLE 4 HERE

INSERT TABLE 5 HERE

Discussion

The results were analyzed for the two subgroups of educators involved in general and special education and then the total population which involved educators in general education, special education, related services and

administrators. The results were analyzed to determine agreement or disagreement on each item of the questionnaire.

. The educators in general and special education either strongly agreed or agreed with items 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 14. The two groups of educators differed on items 13, 15, 16, 21, and 22. Item 13 stated that financial resources should be preserved when students are reintegrated into general education. Educators in general education agreed (60% or 4) with this philosophy while the educators in special education (45% or 17) disagreed or strongly disagreed. Another point of conflict between the two groups of educators arose on item 15. Item 15 purported that with additional consultative assistance, educators in general education would be able to meet the educational needs of their students without a resource room. The educators in special education (55% or 14) agreed with this philosophy but the educators in general education (80% or 6) were mixed between undecided and disagreement. Items 21 and 22 dealt with consultants or therapists coming into the general education classrooms to provide services, and to consult with teachers. The educators involved in special education agreed (65% or 17 and 80% or 20) with the underlying philosophy of these items. The general education educators strongly disagreed (80% or 6) with the philosophy. Item 16 purported the concept that the skills needed to teach disabled and nondisabled students are essentially the same. The general education educators agreed (60%, 4) with the statement while the special education educators (35% or 14) disagreed or strongly disagreed. The undecided option was selected by 10% of the educators involved in special education. Educators in both general and special education strongly disagreed or disagreed with items 5, 17,18, 19, and 20. Neither groups of educators indicated a strong preference on items 11 or 12.

The total population of administrators, related service personnel, and educators in general and special education was analyzed. The response of the

professionals on a majority of the items were in support of inclusive education. The 9 items (3, 6, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 22) selected in disagreement with inclusive education philosophy or practice appeared to indicate some mixed attitudes on the part of the professionals. The idea that students enrolled in special education can be educated in a general classroom with assistance from the special education department, item 1, was overwhelmingly supported (41% agreed and 37% strongly agreed), but the concept that the least restrictive environment can be a self-contained special education classroom, item 3, was accepted (22% or 8 strongly agreed and 40% or 15 agreed). The statement that students with a learning disability who have spatial and time orientation problems would not profit from going to a resource room, item 11, was rejected (30% or 11 disagreed and 30% or 11 strongly disagreed). Item 14 stated that with further preparation and training teachers would be able to effectively meet the educational needs of their resource room students was strongly disagreed with by 30% (11) while 22% (8) strongly agreed. The results appeared to indicate some uncertainties on the part of these professionals. Items 17 and 18 were supportive of special education and the labeling of students into special education categories, but item 6 indicated the professionals felt labeling diminishes students' self worth. Item 21 supported therapists providing services in a general classroom by a narrow margin. Item 22 appeared to indicate, with 33% (12) agreeing and 30% (11) strongly agreeing, that teachers were uneasy about consultants from special education spending time teaching and consulting in their classrooms. In contrast to these nine disagreeing responses, the remaining 13 were supportive of inclusive education. Overall, the professionals supported the concept of educating students with disabilities in general education by teachers of general education (items 1, 2, 5, 9, 10, 16, 20).

The results of the survey were similar to Kennedy's (1990) results. The idea that students enrolled in special education can be educated in a general classroom

with assistance was overwhelmingly supported, but the concept that the least restrictive environment can be a self-contained special education classroom was also accepted. The statement that students with a learning disability who have spatial and time orientation problems would not profit from going to a resource room was rejected in both studies. Also in agreement with Kennedy, the professionals felt that labeling diminishes the students' self worth. Most of the respondents in Kennedy's research felt therapists could provide services in a general education classroom. In both studies the concept of educating students with disabilities in general education was supported.

Views expressed by teachers in focus group research conducted by Vaughn, Schumm, Jallad, Slusher, and Saumell (1996) on the attitudes of teachers toward inclusion support the results of this study. Teachers in the focus groups expressed that the key component of inclusion was the removal of the labeling process. This was viewed as a positive outcome by the teachers. In this study on items 6, 18, and 17 the professionals in New Mexico agreed with the removal of labeling and its positive affects on students. The need for administrators to be knowledgeable regarding inclusion was verified in both research studies. Teachers in the focus groups felt school administrators were unaware of inclusion and were unlikely to consider their interests when establishing policies for inclusion. The large investment of additional resources necessary to enhance the success of inclusion was another concern for the focus group teachers as well as the professionals from New Mexico as recorded on items 13, 19, and 21. The focus group research indicated teachers chose education as a profession because they wanted to teach general education students not students with disabilities. However, several teachers of special education stated they specifically wanted to teach children with disabilities. In this research teachers overwhelmingly agreed with maintaining self-contained special education classrooms. In both research studies a concern was raised over the adequacy of

preparation for general education teachers to meet the needs of students with disabilities. In the focus group research teachers felt adequate preparation was essential. Professionals from New Mexico disagreed with item 15 which stated that given additional consultative support the teachers would be able to meet the educational needs of students with mild disabilities in their classes. In addition, they agreed that with further preparation and training, they would be able to effectively meet the educational needs of students currently served in a resource room program. In both studies, teachers expressed a mixture of attitudes, feelings, and concern regarding inclusion.

Conclusion

The results of the present study indicate that while the majority of the educational professionals are predominately supportive of inclusive education, a small percentage (7-15%) are consistently unsupportive of inclusive education. The results on the nine items (3, 6, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 22) included in the survey which differed with the inclusion philosophy, lend credence to the view that for these professionals located in rural New Mexico there are areas of confusion concerning inclusive education. The survey results indicate the inclusion concept is supported, but the application of the concept to individual classrooms is not equally supported. The results of the surveys indicate that the educators are unsupportive of specific inclusionary actions or practices that would occur in their general education classrooms during the implementation of inclusion.

In rural New Mexico, a full spectrum of special education services are sometimes difficult to provide. Often, the teachers of special education are required to teach all exceptionalities and all levels of severity in one room, sometimes with very limited related services. These circumstances lead to the basic assumption that general education is the best location in rural New Mexico to provide for the needs of students with disabilities. Data collected for the project verify that these professionals view

the general education classroom as an appropriate location for the education of students with disabilities. They also support the continuation of resource rooms and expressed uneasiness about therapists or consultants jointly teaching with them in general education classrooms.

A limitation of the research study was the small number of subjects involved in the study. It can be argued that the sample for this study is too small to draw a valid conclusion. However, New Mexico is a small state with a limited professional population. The percentages of administrators, teachers of special education, and related service personnel in this study are similar to the percentage of professionals in these categories in New Mexico. The individuals who attend the yearly Council for Exceptional Children state conference are often the educational leaders in New Mexico, therefore the results of this project can be viewed as indicative of the attitudes, and knowledge level of the professional leaders in New Mexico. The level of agreement found in this study and the work of Kennedy (1990) and Vaughn et al. (1996) in inclusion and Regular Education Initiative verify the study.

Additional areas for research are indicated as a result of the study. The attitudes of teachers in both special and general education, administrators, and related service providers toward full inclusive education need to be researched further. Parents and students with disabilities were additional populations that warrant investigation. Their views and attitudes toward fully inclusive education should be a vital component in the research of inclusion.

Based upon the conflicting attitudes evidenced in this study, additional research and dialogue among professionals in New Mexico will be needed before inclusive education is fully implemented. It would appear that additional work is required at the "grass roots level" if teachers are to be educated and enlightened with respect to inclusive education. Perhaps, it will be necessary to implement some of the new methods and techniques advocated by inclusive education proponents on a

widespread basis before professionals will be convinced of the feasibility and efficacy of such techniques.

REFERENCES

Bowe, R. (1985). Black adults with disabilities: A statistical report drawn from census bureau data. Washington, DC: President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Brown, D. W., & McIntire, W. G. (1995). Leadership in rural special education. Rural Special Education Quarterly, 14(2) 17-24.

Chezik, K. H., Pratt, J. E., Steward, J. L., & Dear, V. (1989). Addressing services delivery in remote/rural areas. American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, 31 52-55.

D'Alonzo, B. J., & Boggs, E. T. (1990). A review of the General Education Initiative. Preventing School Failure, 35(1) 18-23.

Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. S. (1994). Inclusive schools movement and the radicalization of special education reform. Exceptional Children, 60, 294-309.

Helge, D. I. (1981). Problems in implementing comprehensive special education programming in rural areas. Exceptional Children, 47, 514-520.

Helge, D. I. (1992). Implementing education reform proposals in rural areas. Rural Special Education Quarterly, 11(2), 2-3.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, (IDEA). (1990). 20 U.S.C. Section 1401-1468 and 34 C. F. R., Parts 300-303.

Kennedy, S. (1990). The General Education Initiative in the Anchorage Public Schools. Anchorage, AK: Author. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 330 162).

National Association of State Boards of Education. (1992). Winners All: A Call for Inclusive Schools (The Report of The NASBE Study Group on Special Education). Alexandria, VA: Author.

New Mexico State Department of Education. (1991). Standards for Excellence. Santa Fe, NM: Author.

O'Connell, J. C. (Ed.). (1987). A study of the special problems and needs of American Indians with handicaps both on and off the reservation. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

Pearpoint, J., Forest, M., & Snow, J. (1992). The Inclusion Papers. Toronto: Inclusion Press.

U.S. Department of Commerce. (1994). Statistical abstract of the U.S. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Vaughn, S., Schumm, J. S., Jallad, B., Slusher, J., & Saumell, L. (1996). Teachers' Views of Inclusion. Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 11(2), 96-106.

York, J., Vandercook, T., MacDonald, C., Heise-Neff, C., & Caughey, E. (1992). Students with Severe Disabilities in General Education Classes. Exceptional Children, 58, 244-250.

Table 1

Demographic Background of Subjects

Category	Pre-School	Elementary		Middle		High		Related	Total
		Sp. Ed.	Gen	Sp. Ed.	Gen	Sp. Ed.	Gen		
Gender									
Male	0	0	0	2	1	1	2	2	8
Female	2	8	1	1	1	2	3	1	19
Unreported	1	4	1	2	3	2	0	0	13
Years of Teaching Experience									
1-5	3	2	1	1	2	2	3	1	15
6-10	0	3	0	2	1	1	0	2	9
11-15	0	5	0	1	1	1	2	0	10
15-20	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	5
Years of Administration Experience									
1-5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
6-10	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
11-15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16-20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Position	3	12	2	5	5	4	5	3	39

Table 2

Geographical Distribution of Subjects

Subjects	City	Population	Classification
10	Albuquerque	379,000	urban
2	Aztec	5,012	rural
2	Bloomfield	4,881	rural
2	Belen	5,617	rural
3	Bernaillo	3,026	rural
17	Deming	9,064	rural
3	Hobbs	33,000	rural

Table 3

Special Education Personnel: Percent Responses to Full Inclusion Survey

SA = Strongly Agree A = Agree U = Undecided D = Disagree SD = Strongly Disagree

		SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	Students in special education can be educated in a general classroom with assistance from the special education department.	40	40	10	10	0
2.	General education teachers can be responsible for students enrolled in special education.	20	35	15	5	20
3.	Least restrictive environment can be a self-contained classroom.	40	40	5	0	15
4.	Special education teachers in my building are protective of their students.	45	45	5	5	0
5.	A child with an emotional disturbance can function only in a self-contained classroom.	5	5	15	55	20
6.	I believe labeling diminishes student self worth.	45	25	7	15	8
7.	I believe in-services are valuable for the staff.	55	30	10	5	0
8.	A principal must be knowledgeable in the area of Full Inclusion.	70	30	0	0	0
9.	Our staff works well together.	30	50	10	10	0
10.	Children model the behavior of other children.	50	45	5	0	0
11.	Students with learning disabilities who have spatial and time orientation problems would profit from not having to go to a resource room.	0	45	15	30	10
12.	There is too much duplication of services between Chapter 1, special education, bilingual and migrant services.	25	10	35	30	0

13.	Financial resources currently allotted for students with a mild disability could be preserved if such students are reintegrated into full-time general education.	10	20	25	25	20
14.	Given further preparation & training, I would be able to effectively meet the educational needs of those students currently served by the resource room program.	25	30	12.5	20	12.5
15.	Given additional consultative type support, I would be able to meet the educational needs of students with mild disabilities in my class without the need for a resource room.	25	30	30	15	0
16.	The skills needed to teach mildly disabled and nondisabled students are essentially the same.	10	25	10	25	5
17.	Most children currently labeled learning disabled are not "truly" educationally disabled.	5	5	25	50	15
18.	Identifying students for the purpose of providing special education is a discriminatory practice.	5	12.5	20	50	12.5
19	I feel too much staff money and resources has been allocated for the special education program.	0	5	10	55	30
20.	Scheduling difficulties make it impossible to enact the General Education Initiative or Full Inclusion.	10	25	20	35	10
21.	Other support personnel (therapists) could take their services into a general classroom.	25	40	10	25	0
22	Teachers are uneasy about consultants from the special education department spending time teaching and consulting in their rooms.	40	40	15	5	0

Adapted from: S. Kennedy. (1990). The General Education Initiative in the Anchorage Public Schools. Anchorage, AK: Author.

Table 4

General Education Personnel: Percent Responses to Full Inclusion Survey

SA = Strongly Agree A = Agree U = Undecided D = Disagree SD = Strongly Disagree

		SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	Students in special education can be educated in a general classroom with assistance from the special education department.	40	60	0	0	0
2.	General education teachers can be responsible for students enrolled in special education.	0	60	20	0	20
3.	Least restrictive environment can be a self-contained classroom.	20	60	20	0	0
4.	Special education teachers in my building are protective of their students.	0	60	0	40	0
5.	A child with an emotional disturbance can function only in a self-contained classroom.	0	20	20	60	0
6.	I believe labeling diminishes student self worth.	60	40	0	0	0
7.	I believe in-services are valuable for the staff.	20	40	40	0	0
8.	A principal must be knowledgeable in the area of Full Inclusion.	60	40	0	0	0
9.	Our staff works well together.	60	40	0	0	0
10.	Children model the behavior of other children.	60	40	0	0	0
11.	Students with learning disabilities who have spatial and time orientation problems would profit from not having to go to a resource room.	0	20	60	20	0
12.	There is too much duplication of services between Chapter 1, special education, bilingual and migrant services.	20	0	40	40	0

13.	Financial resources currently allotted for students with a mild disability could be preserved if such students are reintegrated into full-time general education.	0	60	0	40	0
14.	Given further preparation & training, I would be able to effectively meet the educational needs of those students currently served by the resource room program.	20	60	20	0	0
15.	Given additional consultative type support, I would be able to meet the educational needs of students with mild disabilities in my class without the need for a resource room.	20	0	40	40	0
16.	The skills needed to teach mildly disabled and nondisabled students are essentially the same.	0	60	0	20	20
17.	Most children currently labeled learning disabled are not "truly" educationally disabled.	20	0	20	60	0
18.	Identifying students for the purpose of providing special education is a discriminatory practice.	0	0	20	60	20
19	I feel too much staff money and resources has been allocated for the special education program.	0	0	0	100	0
20.	Scheduling difficulties make it impossible to enact the General Education Initiative or Full Inclusion.	0	20	0	80	0
21.	Other support personnel (therapists) could take their services into a general classroom.	20	10	10	80	0
22	Teachers are uneasy about consultants from the special education department spending time teaching and consulting in their rooms.	0	20	0	20	60

Adapted from: S. Kennedy. (1990). The General Education Initiative in the Anchorage Public Schools. Anchorage, AK: Author.

Table 5

Administrators, Special and General Educators: Percent Responses to Full Inclusion Survey

SA = Strongly Agree A= Agree U = Undecided D= Disagree SD = Strongly Disagree

		SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	Students in special education can be educated in a general classroom with assistance from the special education department.	37	41	0	11	11
2.	General education teachers can be responsible for students enrolled in special education.	15	37	22	7	19
3.	Least restrictive environment can be a self-contained classroom.	22	40	11	0	26
4.	Special education teachers in my building are protective of their students.	33	45	0	15	7
5.	A child with an emotional disturbance can function only in a self-contained classroom.	7	15	15	48	15
6.	I believe labeling diminishes student self worth.	41	26	15	11	7
7.	I believe in-services are valuable for the staff.	44	30	0	07	19
8.	A principal must be knowledgeable in the area of Full Inclusion.	68	32	0	0	0
9.	Our staff works well together.	33	37	0	11	19
10.	Children model the behavior of other children.	44	52	0	40	0
11.	Students with learning disabilities who have spatial and time orientation problems would profit from not having to go to a resource room.	3	26	11	30	30
12.	There is too much duplication of services between Chapter 1,					

	special education, bilingual and migrant services.	19	14	0	30	37
13.	Financial resources currently allotted for students with a mild disability could be preserved if such students are reintegrated into full-time general education.	10	26	19	26	19
14.	Given further preparation & training, I would be able to effectively meet the educational needs of those students currently served by the resource room program.	22	26	11	11	30
15.	Given additional consultative type support, I would be able to meet the educational needs of students with mild disabilities in my class without the need for a resource room.	22	15	11	11	41
16.	The skills needed to teach mildly disabled and nondisabled students are essentially the same.	11	30	25	19	15
17.	Most children currently labeled learning disabled are not "truly" educationally disabled.	11	7	11	49	22
18.	Identifying students for the purpose of providing special education is a discriminatory practice.	7	11	11	49	22
19	I feel too much staff money and resources has been allocated for the special education program.	0	4	15	59	22
20.	Scheduling difficulties make it impossible to enact the General Education Initiative or Full Inclusion.	4	26	18	45	7
21.	Other support personnel (therapists) could take their services into a general classroom.	22	33	0	30	15
22	Teachers are uneasy about consultants from the special education department spending time teaching and consulting in their rooms.	30	33	11	11	15

Adapted from: S. Kennedy. (1990). The General Education Initiative in the Anchorage Public Schools. Anchorage, AK: Author.